arXiv:1412.4219v1 [math.AP] 13 Dec 2014

Multiplicity of multi-bump type nodal solutions for a class of elliptic problems with exponential critical growth in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Claudianor O. Alves* and Denilson S. Pereira†
Universidade Federal de Campina Grande
Unidade Acadêmica de Matemática - UAMat
CEP: 58.429-900 - Campina Grande - PB - Brazil

Abstract

In this paper, we establish the existence and multiplicity of multi-bump nodal solutions for the following class of problems

$$-\Delta u + (\lambda V(x) + 1)u = f(u), \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2,$$

where $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, f is a continuous function with exponential critical growth and $V : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function verifying some hypotheses.

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2010): 35A15, 35J15

Keywords: Variational Methods, Exponential critical growth; Nodal solution.

1 Introduction

In the present paper, we study the existence and multiplicity of multi-bump nodal solutions for the following class of problems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (\lambda V(x) + 1)u = f(u), & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \\ u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \end{cases} \tag{P}_\lambda$$

*Partially supported by CNPq - Grant 304036/2013-7, coalves@dme.ufcg.edu.br
†denilsonsp@dme.ufcg.edu.br

where $\lambda \in (0,\infty)$, $V : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a nonnegative continuous function and f is a continuous function having an exponential critical growth at $\pm\infty$, i.e., there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{|t|\to+\infty} \frac{|f(s)|}{e^{\alpha s^2}} = 0, \quad \forall \alpha > \alpha_0; \qquad \lim_{|t|\to+\infty} \frac{|f(s)|}{e^{\alpha s^2}} = +\infty, \quad \forall \alpha < \alpha_0.$$

There are a lot of papers concerning with existence and multiplicity of positive solutions for $(P)_\lambda$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, where the behavior of function V plays an important role. For the case $N \geq 3$, we would like to cite the papers due to Bartsch and Wang [12], Clapp and Ding [16], Bartsch, Pankov and Wang [11], Gui [26], Ding and Tanaka [23], Alves, de Morais Filho and Souto [5] and references therein.

In [23], Ding and Tanaka considered the problem $(P)_\lambda$ assuming that $\Omega = int\ V^{-1}(\{0\})$ has k connected components and $f(s) = |s|^{q-2}s$ with $2 < q < \frac{2N}{N-2}$. In that paper, it was proved that $(P)_\lambda$ has at least $2^k - 1$ multi-bump positive solutions for large λ. The same type of problem was considered by Alves, de Morais Filho and Souto in [5] and Alves and Souto [10], by assuming that f has a critical growth for the case $N \geq 3$ and exponential critical growth when $N = 2$, respectively.

In [4], motivated by [16] and [23], Alves has considered the existence and multiplicity of multi-bump nodal solutions for $(P)_\lambda$, when the nonlinearity f has a subcritical growth.

The motivation of our work comes from the references mentioned above, once we have observed that until moment, the existence and multiplicity of multi-bump nodal solution for $(P)_\lambda$, when f has exponential critical growth in $\mathbb{R}^2$, were not considered. Here, we have used a different approach in some estimates, because in our opinion, some properties that are valid for $N \geq 3$, we cannot repeat for the class of problems here studied, therefore a careful analysis is needed.

Here, we use a result related to the existence of least energy nodal solutions for the Dirichlet Problem on a bounded domain due to Alves and Pereira [9], which is a version of results due to Bartsch, Weth and Willem [14] (see also Bartsch and Weth [13]) for critical growth in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Moreover, we mention that the technique developed in [9] can employ to prove an existence result of least energy nodal solutions for a class of elliptic problems on a bounded domain with Neumann boundary condition. These solutions play an important role in our arguments to get multi-bump nodal solutions. Furthermore, as in [4], we modify all the sets that appear in the minimax arguments found in [23] to get nodal solutions. Our main result completes the studies made in [23], [10] and [4], in the following points:

- In [23], the nonlinearity is homogeneous with subcritical growth, the solutions are positive and $N \geq 3$.

- In [10], the nonlinearity has an exponential critical growth and $N = 2$, but the solutions are positive.

- In [4], the solution are multi-bump nodal, however the nonlinearity has subcritical growth in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and $N \geq 3$.

We would like to mention that problems involving exponential critical growth have received a special attention at last years, see for example, [6, 15, 22, 24, 25] for semilinear elliptic equations, and [1, 18, 19, 20, 21] for quasilinear equations.,

Since we will work with exponential critical growth, some versions of the Trudinger-Moser inequality are crucial in arguments. The first version that we would like to recall is due to Trundiger and Moser, see [28] and [29], which claims if Ω is a bounded domain with smooth boundary, then for any $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$,

$$\int_\Omega e^{\alpha u^2} dx < +\infty, \quad \text{for every} \ \ \alpha > 0. \tag{1.1}$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant $C = C(\alpha, |\Omega|)$ such that

$$\sup_{||u||_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq 1} \int_\Omega e^{\alpha u^2} dx \leq C, \quad \forall\, \alpha \leq 4\pi. \tag{1.2}$$

A version in $H^1(\Omega)$ has been proved by Adimurthi and Yadava [2], and it says that if Ω is again a bounded domain with smooth boundary, then for any $u \in H^1(\Omega)$,

$$\int_\Omega e^{\alpha u^2} dx < +\infty, \quad \text{for every} \ \ \alpha > 0. \tag{1.3}$$

Furthermore, there exists a positive constant $C = C(\alpha, |\Omega|)$ such that

$$\sup_{||u||_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq 1} \int_\Omega e^{\alpha u^2} dx \leq C, \quad \forall\, \alpha \leq 2\pi. \tag{1.4}$$

The third version that we will use is due to Cao [15], which is version of the Trundiger-Moser inequality in whole space $\mathbb{R}^2$ and has the following statement:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(e^{\alpha u^2} - 1 \right) dx < +\infty, \ \ \text{for all} \ \ u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \ \ \text{and} \ \alpha > 0. \tag{1.5}$$

Besides, if $\alpha < 4\pi$ and $|u|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq M$, there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(M, \alpha)$ verifying

$$\sup_{|\nabla u|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq 1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(e^{\alpha u^2} - 1 \right) dx \leq C_1. \tag{1.6}$$

In what follows, let us denote $\Omega = int\ V^{-1}(\{0\})$ and we suppose that

$(H1)$ Ω is non-empty, bounded, $\partial\Omega$ is smooth and $V^{-1}(\{0\}) = \overline{\Omega}$;

$(H2)$ Ω has k connected components denoted by Ω_j, $j \in \{1, ..., k\}$, such that $dist(\Omega_i, \Omega_j) > 0$ for $i \neq j$.

Hereafter, the function f satisfies the ensuing assumptions:

(f_1) There is $C > 0$ such that

$$|f(s)| \leq Ce^{4\pi|s|^2} \quad \text{for all} \quad s \in \mathbb{R};$$

(f_2) $\lim\limits_{s\to 0} \dfrac{f(s)}{s} = 0$;

(f_3) There is $\theta > 2$ such that

$$0 < \theta F(s) := \theta \int_0^s f(t)dt \leq sf(s), \quad \text{for all} \quad s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}.$$

(f_4) The function $s \to \dfrac{f(s)}{|s|}$ is strictly increasing in $(0, +\infty)$.

(f_5) There exist constants $p > 2$ and $C_p > 0$ such that

$$sign(s)f(s) \geq C_p|s|^{p-1} \quad \text{for all} \quad s \in \mathbb{R}$$

with

$$C_p > \left[\frac{4k\theta}{\theta - 2} S_p \right]^{(p-2)/2},$$

where $S_p = \max\limits_{1\leq j\leq k} \gamma_j$, $\gamma_j = \inf\limits_{u\in\mathcal{M}_{\Omega_j}} \phi_j(u)$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\Omega_j} = \left\{ u \in H_0^1(\Omega_j) : \ u^{\pm} \neq 0 \text{ and } \phi_j'(u^{\pm})u^{\pm} = 0 \right\}$$

and

$$\phi_j(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega_j} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + |u|^2 \right) - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\Omega_j} |u|^p.$$

It is easily seen that $(f_1)-(f_5)$ hold for nonlinearities of the form

$$f(s) = 2\alpha s\left(e^{\alpha s^2}-1\right), \text{ for } \alpha \in (0, 4\pi).$$

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1 *Assume that $(f_1)-(f_5)$ and $(H_1)-(H_2)$ hold. Then, for any non-empty subset Γ of $\{1,...,k\}$, there exists $\lambda^* > 0$ such that, for $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$, problem $(P)_\lambda$ has a nodal solution u_λ. Moreover, the family $\{u_\lambda\}_{\lambda\geq\lambda^*}$ has the following property: For any sequence $\lambda_n \to \infty$, we can extract a subsequence λ_{n_i} such that $u_{\lambda_{n_i}}$ converges strongly in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to a function u which satisfies $u(x) = 0$ for $x \notin \Omega_\Gamma = \cup_{j\in\Gamma}\Omega_j$, and the restriction $u|_{\Omega_j}$ is a nodal solution with least energy of*

$$-\Delta u + u = f(u), \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega_j, \quad u|_{\partial\Omega_j} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j \in \Gamma.$$

The plan of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, we prove some technical results involving bounded domains, which will be useful in the proof the Theorem 1.1. In Sections 3 and 4, we consider an auxiliary problem and study some properties of the energy functional associated with that problem. Finally in Section 5, we prove the main result.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, we will use the following notations:

- If h is a measurable function, we denote by $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h$ the following integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} h(x)dx$.
- The symbols $\|u\|$, $|u|_r$ $(r > 1)$ and $|u|_\infty$ denote the usual norms in the spaces $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $L^r(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, respectively.
- For an open set $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the symbols $\|u\|_\Theta$, $|u|_{r,\Theta}$ $(r > 1)$ and $|u|_{\infty,\Theta}$ denote the usual norms in the spaces $H^1(\Theta)$, $L^r(\Theta)$ and $L^\infty(\Theta)$, respectively.

From now on, we will work with the space $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_\lambda = \left\{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)u^2 < \infty\right\}$$

endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|_\lambda = \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + (\lambda V(x)+1)u^2\right)\right]^{1/2}.$$

It is easy to see that $(\mathcal{H}_\lambda, \|\cdot\|_\lambda)$ is a Hilbert space for $\lambda > 0$.

We also write for an open set $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\mathcal{H}_\lambda(\Theta) = \left\{u \in H^1(\Theta) : \int_\Theta V(x)u^2 < \infty\right\}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{\lambda,\Theta} = \left[\int_{\Theta} \left(|\nabla u|^2 + (\lambda V(x)+1)u^2\right)\right]^{1/2}.$$

As a consequence of the above considerations, there exist $\nu_0, \delta_0 > 0$ with $1 \approx \delta_0 < 1$ and $\nu_0 \approx 0$ such that for all open set $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\delta_0\|u\|^2_{\lambda,\Theta} \le \|u\|^2_{\lambda,\Theta} - \nu_0|u|^2_{2,\Theta}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda(\Theta) \text{ and } \lambda > 0. \tag{2.1}$$

From assumptions (f_1) and (f_2), given $\epsilon > 0$, $q \ge 1$ and $\tau > 1$, there exists a constant $C = C(\epsilon, q, \alpha) > 0$ such that

$$|sf(s)|, \quad |F(s)| \le \epsilon s^2 + C|s|^q b_\tau(s), \quad \text{for all} \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$b_\tau(s) := \left(e^{4\pi\tau s^2} - 1\right).$$

The below result is a consequence of Trundinger-Moser inequality given in (1.6) and its proof can be found in [10].

Corollary 2.1 *Let (u_λ) be a family in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying $\sup_{\lambda\ge1}\|u_\lambda\|^2 \le m < 1$. For $\tau, q > 1$ satisfying $\tau q m < 1$, there exists $C = C(\tau, q, m) > 0$ such that $b_\tau(u_\lambda) = \left(e^{4\pi\tau u_\lambda^2} - 1\right)$ belongs to $L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and*

$$\sup_{\lambda\ge1}\{|b_\tau(u_\lambda)|_q\} < \infty.$$

2.1 Neumann and Dirichlet problems

In this section, we denote by $I_j : H_0^1(\Omega_j) \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi_{\lambda,j} : H^1(\Omega_j') \to \mathbb{R}$ the following energy functionals

$$I_j(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_j}(|\nabla u|^2 + u^2) - \int_{\Omega_j} F(u)$$

and

$$\Phi_{\lambda,j}(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega_j'}(|\nabla u|^2 + (\lambda V(x)+1)u^2) - \int_{\Omega_j'} F(u).$$

It is well known that I_j and $\Phi_{\lambda,j}$ are C^1 and their critical points are weak solutions of the problems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u \;=\; f(u), \;\; \text{in} \;\; \Omega_j, \\ \qquad\quad u \;=\; 0, \;\text{on}\; \partial\Omega_j \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + (\lambda V(x)+1)u \;=\; f(u), \;\; \text{in} \;\; \Omega_j', \\ \qquad\qquad\quad \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \;=\; 0, \;\text{on}\; \partial\Omega_j', \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

respectively.

Hereafter, d_j and $d_{\lambda,j}$ denote the real numbers given by

$$d_j = \inf_{\mathcal{M}_j} I_j \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\lambda,j} = \inf_{\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,j}} \Phi_{\lambda,j},$$

where $\mathcal{M}_j$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,j}$ denote the nodal Nehari sets

$$\mathcal{M}_j = \{u \in H_0^1(\Omega_j) : \; u^{\pm} \neq 0 \;\; \text{and} \;\; I_j'(u^{\pm})u^{\pm} = 0\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,j} = \{u \in H^1(\Omega_j') : \; u^{\pm} \neq 0 \;\; \text{and} \;\; \Phi_{\lambda,j}'(u^{\pm})u^{\pm} = 0\}.$$

By a result found in [9], we know that there is $w_j \in \mathcal{M}_j$ verifying

$$I_j(w_j) = d_j \quad \text{and} \quad I_j'(w_j) = 0.$$

Here, we would like to point that the same approach can be employed to show that there is $w_{\lambda,j} \in \mathcal{M}_{\lambda,j}$ satisfying

$$\Phi_{\lambda,j}(w_{\lambda,j}) = d_{\lambda,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{\lambda,j}'(w_{\lambda,j}) = 0.$$

To see why, it remains to observe that (f_5) yields if (v_n) is a Palais-Smale sequence associated to $\Phi_{\lambda,j}$ at $d_{\lambda,j}$, then

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \|v_n\|^2_{\Omega'_j} < 1/2.$$

The above estimate is the key point to apply the Trudinger-Moser inequality due to Adimurthi and Yadava, see (1.4). In doing so, the reader will see that the existence of $w_{\lambda,j}$ follows as in [9], replacing $H^1_0(\Omega)$ by $H^1(\Omega)$.

3 An auxiliary problem

In this section, as in [4], [17] and [23], we will modify conveniently the function f.

To this end, let ν_0 be the constant given in (2.1), $a > 0$ verifying $\max\{f(a)/a, f(-a)/(-a)\} < \nu_0$ and $\tilde{f}, \tilde{F} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ the following functions

$$\tilde{f}(s) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{-f(-a)}{a}s & \text{if } s < -a, \\ f(s) & \text{if } |s| \le a, \\ \dfrac{f(a)}{a}s & \text{if } s > a \end{cases}$$

and

$$\tilde{F}(s) = \int_0^s \tilde{f}(\tau)d\tau,$$

which fulfills the inequalities

$$\tilde{f}(s) \le \nu_0|s|, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\tilde{f}(s)s \le \nu_0|s|^2, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\tilde{F}(s) \le \frac{\nu_0}{2}|s|^2, \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.3}$$

From now on, for each subset $\Gamma \subset \{1, ..., k\}$, let us consider

$$\chi_\Gamma = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } x \in \Omega'_\Gamma, \\ 0, & \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma, \end{cases}$$

where $\Omega'_\Gamma = \cup_{j\in\Gamma}\Omega'_j$. Using the above functions, we define

$$g(x,s) = \chi_\Gamma(x)f(s) + (1-\chi_\Gamma(x))\tilde{f}(s)$$

and

$$G(x,s) = \int_0^s g(x,t)dt = \chi_\Gamma(x)F(s) + (1-\chi_\Gamma(x))\tilde{F}(s).$$

It is easy to see that g satisfies (2.2) uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$, that is,

$$|g(x,s)| \le \epsilon|s| + C|s|^{q-1}b_\tau(s), \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{3.4}$$

Using the above estimate, it follows that $\Phi_\lambda : \mathcal{H}_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\Phi_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}(|\nabla u|^2 + (\lambda V(x)+1)u^2) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} G(x,u)$$

belongs to $C^1(\mathcal{H}_\lambda, \mathbb{R})$ and its critical points are weak solutions of

$$-\Delta u + (\lambda V(x)+1)u = g(x,u) \ \text{ in } \ \mathbb{R}^2. \qquad (A)_\lambda$$

Remark 3.1 *In this moment, we would like to detach that some nodal solutions of $(A)_\lambda$ are solutions of the original problem $(P)_\lambda$. More precisely, if u_λ is a nodal solution of $(A)_\lambda$ verifying $|u(x)| \le a$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma$, then it is a nodal solution for $(P)_\lambda$.*

In the sequel, we study the convergence of Palais-Smale sequences related to the functional Φ_λ. The first of them is related to boundedness of these sequences. However, it follows repeating the same arguments explored in [10, Lemma 3.1], then we will omit its proof.

Lemma 3.2 *If (u_n) is a $(PS)_c$ sequence to Φ_λ, then*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|u_n\|_\lambda^2 \le \frac{2\theta c}{\delta_0(\theta-2)},$$

where δ_0 is given in (2.1).

In the next, we denote by D the ensuing real number

$$D = \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j.$$

This number is very special for us, because we will show that Φ_λ verifies the well known Palais-Smale in $(0, D]$. To prove this fact, we need of the following estimate from above for D.

Lemma 3.3 *If* $(f_1)-(f_5)$ *holds, then* $0<D<\dfrac{\delta_0(\theta-2)}{4\theta}$.

Proof. In order to prove this inequality, for each $j\in\{1,...,k\}$, we fix a nodal function $v_j\in H_0^1(\Omega_j)$ such that $v_j\in\mathcal{M}_{\Omega_j}$ and

$$\phi_j(v_j)=\gamma_j. \tag{3.5}$$

The reader can find the proof of the existence of such functions in [13]. Since $v_j^{\pm}\neq 0$, there exist $s_j,\ t_j>0$ such that $s_jv_j^+ + t_jv_j^-\in\mathcal{M}_j$. Thus,

$$d_j\leq I_j(s_jv_j^+ + t_jv_j^-)=I_j(s_jv_j^+)+I_j(t_jv_j^-),$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} d_j\leq\ & \frac{s_j^2}{2}\int_{\Omega_j}(|\nabla v_j^+|^2+|v_j^+|^2)-\int_{\Omega_j}F(s_jv_j^+)\\ & +\frac{t_j^2}{2}\int_{\Omega_j}(|\nabla v_j^-|^2+|v_j^-|^2)-\int_{\Omega_j}F(t_jv_j^-). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $v_j^{\pm}\in\mathcal{M}_{\Omega_j}$ and (f_4), we obtain

$$d_j\leq\left\{\frac{s_j^2}{2}-\frac{C_ps_j^p}{p}\right\}\int_{\Omega_j}|v_j^+|^p+\left\{\frac{t_j^2}{2}-\frac{C_pt_j^p}{p}\right\}\int_{\Omega_j}|v_j^-|^p.$$

Then,

$$d_j\leq\max_{r\geq 0}\left\{\frac{r^2}{2}-\frac{C_pr^p}{p}\right\}\int_{\Omega_j}|v_j|^p.$$

Noting that

$$\max_{r\geq 0}\left\{\frac{r^2}{2}-\frac{C_pr^p}{p}\right\}=C_p^{\frac{2}{2-p}}\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right),$$

it follows

$$d_j\leq C_p^{\frac{2}{2-p}}\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{p}\right)\int_{\Omega}|v_j|^p.$$

Combining (3.5) with the above inequality, we derive

$$d_j\leq C_p^{\frac{2}{2-p}}\gamma_j,$$

and so,

$$D = \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j \leq kS_p C_p^{\frac{2}{2-p}} < \frac{\theta - 2}{4\theta}.$$

Since δ_0 can be chosen close to 1, the last inequality leads to

$$D < \frac{\delta_0(\theta - 2)}{4\theta}.$$

■

Proposition 3.4 *For $\lambda \geq 1$, the functional Φ_λ satisfies $(PS)_c$ condition for all $c \in (0, D]$. More precisely, any $(PS)_c$ sequence $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ to Φ_λ has a strongly convergent subsequence in $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$.*

Proof. Let $(u_n) \subset \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ be a Palais-Smale sequence for Φ_λ at the level $c \in (0, D]$. By Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|u_n\|_\lambda^2 \leq \frac{2\theta D}{\delta_0(\theta - 2)} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Thus, (u_n) is a bounded sequence in $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$. Since $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ is a reflexive Banach space, there exists $u \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ such that, for some subsequence, still denoted by (u_n),

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } \mathcal{H}_\lambda, \quad u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad \text{and} \quad u_n \to u \text{ in } L^s_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2), \ \forall s \geq 1.$$

Using similar arguments as in [17, Lemma 1.1], for each $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $R > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0)} \left(|\nabla u_n|^2 + (\lambda V(x) + 1)|u_n|^2\right) \leq \epsilon. \tag{3.6}$$

Claim 3.5 *The following limits occur*

(a) $\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(x, u_n)u_n \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(x, u)u;$

(b) $\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(x, u_n)v \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(x, u)v, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda.$

In fact, from (3.4),

$$|g(x,u_n)u_n| \le \eta|u_n|^2 + C_\eta|u_n|b_\tau(u_n), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2,\ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then, setting the functions

$$h_n := \eta|u_n|^2 + C_\eta|u_n|b_\tau(u_n) \quad \text{and} \quad h := \eta|u|^2 + C_\eta|u|b_\tau(u),$$

it follows that $|g(x,u_n)u_n| \le h_n(x)$. Since, $u_n \to u$ in $L^s_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\forall s \ge 1$, we can assume that

$$u_n(x) \to u(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } B_R(0),$$

for any $R > 0$. Then,

$$g(x,u_n(x))u_n(x) \to g(x,u(x))u(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } B_R(0)$$

and

$$h_n(x) \to h(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } B_R(0).$$

We claim that

$$h_n \to h \quad \text{em } L^1(B_R(0)).$$

Indeed, since $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|u_n\|^2_\lambda < 1$, for a fixed $m \in (0,1)$, there is a subsequence of (u_n), still denoted by (u_n), such that

$$\sup_{n\ge1} \|u_n\|^2 \le m < 1.$$

Fixing $q, \tau > 1$ sufficiently close to 1, such that $\tau q m < 1$, by Corollary 2.1 there exists $C > 0$ such that $b_\tau(u_n) \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with

$$|b_\tau(u_n)|_q \le C, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thereby, $(b_\tau(u_n))_n$ is a bounded sequence in $L^q(B_R(0))$ and

$$b_\tau(u_n) \rightharpoonup b_\tau(u) \quad \text{in } L^q(B_R(0)).$$

Since

$$|u_n| \to |u| \quad \text{em } L^{q'}(B_R(0)), \quad \text{where } 1/q + 1/q' = 1,$$

we have

$$|u_n|b_\tau(u_n) \to |u|b_\tau(u) \quad \text{in } L^1(B_R(0)).$$

From this, $h_n \to h$ in $L^1(B_R(0))$, and so,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left| \int_{B_R(0)} g(x,u_n)u_n - \int_{B_R(0)} g(x,u)u \right| = 0,$$

for any $R > 0$. Now, in what follows, we set

$$L_{n,1} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0)} |g(x,u_n)u_n - g(x,u)u|.$$

From (3.3),

$$|g(x,t)t| = \tilde{f}(t)t \leq \nu_0 |t|^2, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0),\ t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n,1} &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0)} \nu_0 |u_n|^2 + \nu_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0)} |u|^2 \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0)} \left(|\nabla u_n|^2 + (\lambda V(x) + 1)|u_n|^2 \right) + \nu_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0)} |u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

From (3.6), given $\epsilon > 0$, there is $R > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \to +\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0)} \left(|\nabla u_n|^2 + (\lambda V(x) + 1)|u_n|^2 \right) \leq \epsilon$$

Since $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, increasing R if necessary, we also can suppose that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_R(0)} |u|^2 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\nu_0}.$$

In doing so, we get

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} L_{n,1} \leq 2\epsilon, \quad \forall \epsilon > 0,$$

implying that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} L_{n,1} = 0.$$

From this, we have (a). The proof of (b) follows using the same argument.

Now, recalling that

$$\|u_n - u\|_\lambda^2 = \|u_n\|_{\lambda_n}^2 - 2\langle u_n, u \rangle_\lambda + \|u\|_\lambda^2,$$

the limits $\Phi'_\lambda(u_n)u_n = o_n(1)$ and $\Phi'_\lambda(u_n)u = o_n(1)$ lead to

$$\|u_n - u\|_\lambda^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(x,u_n)u_n - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(x,u_n)u + o_n(1). \tag{3.7}$$

Combining the last equality with the Claim 3.5, we derive

$$u_n \to u \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{H}_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad H^1(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

showing that Φ_λ satisfies the $(PS)_c$ condition, for $c \in (0, D]$. ∎

Our next goal is to study the behavior of a generalized Palais-Smale sequence corresponding to a sequence of functionals. From now on, we say that $(u_n) \subset H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is a $(PS)_{\infty,c}$ sequence, if there exist $\lambda_n \to \infty$ such that $u_n \in \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_n}$ verifying

$$\Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to c \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi'_{\lambda_n}(u_n)\|^*_{\lambda_n} \to 0. \qquad (PS)_{\infty,c}$$

The proof of the next proposition follows with the same arguments found in [10, Proposition 3.2], then we will omits it proof.

Proposition 3.6 *Let (u_n) be a $(PS)_{\infty,c}$ sequence with $c \in (0, D]$. Then, for some subsequence, still denoted by (u_n), there exists $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that*

$$u_n \to u \quad \textit{in} \quad H^1(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Moreover,

(i) $u \equiv 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_\Gamma$ *and* $u|_\Omega$ *is a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u = f(u), & \textit{in} \quad \Omega_j, \\ u = 0, & \textit{on} \quad \partial\Omega_j, \end{cases} \qquad (P)_j$$

for each $j \in \Gamma$*;*

(ii) $\|u_n - u\|_{\lambda_n} \to 0$*;*

(iii)

$$\lambda_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_n|^2 \to 0, \quad \|u_n\|^2_{\lambda_n, \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_\Gamma} \to 0$$

and

$$\|u_n\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_j} \to \int_{\Omega_j} (|\nabla u|^2 + u^2) \quad \textit{for all} \quad j \in \Gamma.$$

Now, we are able to study the boundedness outside Ω'_Γ for some solutions of $(A)_\lambda$. To this end, we will use the Moser iteration technique [27], adapting arguments found in [8] and [10].

Proposition 3.7 *Let $\{u_\lambda\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ be a family of nodal solution of $(A)_\lambda$ with $\|u_\lambda\|^2 \leq m < 1$ for all $\lambda \geq 1$. Then, there exists $K > 0$ such that*

$$|u_\lambda|_\infty \leq K, \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1.$$

Proof. The basic idea is as following: For each $\lambda \geq 1$, $L > 0$ and $\beta > 1$, let

$$u^+_{L,\lambda} := \begin{cases} u^+_\lambda, & \text{if} \quad u_\lambda \leq L, \\ L, & \text{if} \quad u_\lambda \geq L, \end{cases}$$

$$z^+_{L,\lambda} := (u^+_{L,\lambda})^{2(\beta-1)} u^+_\lambda \qquad \text{and} \qquad w^+_{L,\lambda} := u^+_\lambda (u^+_{L,\lambda})^{\beta-1}.$$

Using the fact that u_λ is a nodal solution to (A_λ) and taking $z^+_{L,n}$ as a test function, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla u^+_\lambda \nabla z^+_{L,\lambda} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (\lambda V(x) + 1) u^+_\lambda z^+_{L,\lambda} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(x, u^+_\lambda) z^+_{L,\lambda}. \tag{3.8}$$

Recalling that given $\epsilon > 0$ there is $C_\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$g(x, u^+_\lambda) \leq \epsilon u^+_\lambda + C_\epsilon b_\tau(u^+_\lambda) u^+_\lambda, \tag{3.9}$$

where $b_\tau(u^+_\lambda) \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for some $q > 1$, $q \approx 1$ with

$$|b_\tau(u^+_\lambda)|_q \leq C, \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1, \tag{3.10}$$

it follows from (3.9) and (3.8),

$$|w^+_{L,\lambda}|^2_\gamma \leq C\beta^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} b_\tau(u^+_\lambda) |w^+_{L,\lambda}|^2.$$

Using Hölder's inequality,

$$|w^+_{L,\lambda}|^2_\gamma \leq C\beta^2 \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |b_\tau(u^+_\lambda)|^q \right]^{1/q} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w^+_{L,\lambda}|^{2q'} \right]^{1/q'},$$

where $1/q + 1/q' = 1$. Then, by (3.10),

$$|w^+_{L,\lambda}|^2_\gamma \leq C\beta^2 |w^+_{L,\lambda}|^2_{2q'}, \quad \forall \lambda \geq 1,$$

for any $L > 0$, $\beta > 1$ and $\gamma \geq 2$, where $C > 0$ depends only on γ.

Note that by Sobolev imbedding $|u_\lambda^+|^\beta \in L^{2q'}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Thus,

$$|w_{L,\lambda}^+|_\gamma^2 \le C\beta^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_\lambda^+ (u_{L,\lambda}^+)^{\beta-1}|^{2q'}\right)^{1/q'} \le C\beta^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_\lambda^+|^{2q'\beta}\right)^{1/q'} < +\infty$$

Using Fatous' lemma in the variable L, we derive

$$\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_\lambda^+|^{\gamma\beta}\right)^{2q'/\gamma} \le C^{2q'}\beta^{2q'} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_\lambda^+|^{2q'\beta},$$

from where it follows that

$$|u_\lambda^+|_{\beta\gamma} \le C^{1/\beta}\beta^{1/\beta}|u_\lambda^+|_{\beta 2q'}, \tag{3.11}$$

Now, fixing $\gamma > 2q'$, we get

$$|u_\lambda^+|_\infty \le \bar{K}, \quad \forall\lambda \ge 1. \tag{3.12}$$

Analogously, if we define for each $\lambda \ge 1$, $L > 0$ and $\beta > 1$, the functions $u_\lambda^- = \max\{-u_\lambda, 0\}$,

$$u_{L,\lambda}^- := \begin{cases} u_\lambda^-, & \text{if} \quad u_\lambda \ge -L, \\ L, & \text{if} \quad u_\lambda \le -L, \end{cases}$$

$$z_{L,\lambda}^- := u_\lambda^-(u_{L,\lambda}^-)^{2(\beta-1)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad w_{L,\lambda,i}^- := u_\lambda^-(u_{L,\lambda}^-)^{\beta-1},$$

we can prove that

$$|u_\lambda^-|_\infty \le \tilde{K}, \quad \forall\lambda \ge 1. \tag{3.13}$$

Therefore, from (3.12) and (3.13),

$$|u_\lambda|_\infty \le K, \ \ \forall\lambda \ge 1, \tag{3.14}$$

for some $K > 0$, which proves the proposition.

■

Proposition 3.8 *Let $\{u_\lambda\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ be a family of nodal solution of $(A)_\lambda$ with $\|u_\lambda\|^2 \le m < 1$ and $u_\lambda \to 0$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_\Gamma)$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. Then, there exists $\lambda^* > 0$ with the following property:*

$$|u_\lambda|_{\infty,\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\Omega_\Gamma'} \le a, \quad \forall\lambda \ge \lambda^*.$$

Hence, u_λ is a nodal solution of $(P)_\lambda$ for $\lambda \ge \lambda^*$.

Proof. In this proof, we adapt some arguments explored in [7] to get an estimate for the L^∞-norm of the family $\{u_\lambda\}$ on a neighborhood of $\partial\Omega'_\Gamma$. In doing so, we will conclude easily the proof of the proposition.

Let $x_1, ..., x_l \in \partial\Omega'_\Gamma$, $R > 0$ and $0 < r < R/2$ such that

$$\partial\Omega'_\Gamma \subset \mathcal{N}(\partial\Omega'_\Gamma) := \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} B_{R+r}(x_i)$$

and

$$B_{R+r}(x_i) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_\Gamma, \quad \forall i \in \{1, ..., l\}.$$

Consider $\eta_i \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $0 \leq \eta_i \leq 1$ with

$$\eta_i(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if} \quad |x - x_i| \leq R \\ 0, & \text{if} \quad |x - x_i| \geq R + r \end{cases}$$

and $|\nabla\eta_i| \leq 2/r$, for each $i \in \{1, ..., l\}$.

Now, for each $\lambda \geq 1$, $L > 0$ and $\beta > 1$, let us define

$$u^+_{L,\lambda} := \begin{cases} u^+_\lambda, & \text{if} \quad u_\lambda \leq L, \\ L, & \text{if} \quad u_\lambda \geq L, \end{cases}$$

$$z^+_{L,\lambda,i} := \eta_i^2 u^+_\lambda (u^+_{L,\lambda})^{2(\beta-1)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad w^+_{L,\lambda,i} := \eta_i u^+_\lambda (u^+_{L,\lambda})^{\beta-1}.$$

Repeating the same ideas employed in the proof of Proposition 3.8, it follows that

$$|w^+_{L,\lambda,i}|^2_\gamma \leq C\beta^2 \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u^+_\lambda|^2 (u^+_{L,\lambda})^{2(\beta-1)} |\nabla\eta_i|^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} b_\tau(u^+_\lambda)\eta_i^2 |u^+_\lambda|^2 (u^+_{L,\lambda})^{2(\beta-1)} \right]. \tag{3.15}$$

Using Proposition 3.8 and the definition of b_τ, we obtain $|b_\tau(u^+_\lambda)|_\infty \leq C$, for all $\lambda \geq 1$ and some constant $C > 0$. Then, from definition of η_i and (3.15),

$$\left(\int_{B_R(x_i)} |u^+_\lambda|^\gamma (u_{L,\lambda})^{\gamma(\beta-1)} \right)^{2/\gamma} \leq C\beta^2 \int_{B_{R+r(x_i)}} |u^+_\lambda|^{2\beta}.$$

Using Fatous' lemma in the variable L, we obtain

$$\left(\int_{B_R(x_i)} |u^+_\lambda|^{\gamma\beta} \right)^{2/\gamma} \leq C\beta^2 \int_{B_{R+r(x_i)}} |u^+_\lambda|^{2\beta}. \tag{3.16}$$

Now, if $\beta = \dfrac{\gamma(t-1)}{2t}$ with $t = \dfrac{\gamma^2}{2(\gamma-2)}$, then $\beta > 1$, $\dfrac{2t}{t-1} < \gamma$ and $u_\lambda^+ \in L^{\beta 2t/(t-1)}(B_{R+r}(x_i))$. It follows from (3.16) and Hölder's inequality with exponents $t/(t-1)$ and t that

$$\left(\int_{B_R(x_i)} |u_\lambda^+|^{\gamma\beta}\right)^{2/\gamma} \leq C\beta^2 \left[\int_{B_{R+r}(x_i)} |u_\lambda^+|^{2\beta t/(t-1)}\right]^{(t-1)/t} \left[\int_{B_{R+r}(x_i)} 1\right]^{1/t},$$

that is,

$$|u_\lambda^+|_{L^{\gamma\beta}(B_R(x_i))} \leq C^{1/\beta}\beta^{1/\beta}|u_\lambda^+|_{L^{2\beta t/(t-1)}(B_{R+r}(x_i))}. \tag{3.17}$$

If we consider $\chi = \dfrac{\gamma(t-1)}{2t}$ and $s = \dfrac{2t}{t-1}$, the inequality in (3.17) gives

$$|u_\lambda^+|_{L^{\chi^{n+1}s}(B_R(x_i))} \leq C^{\sum_{i=1}^n \chi^{-i}} \chi^{\sum_{i=1}^n i\chi^{-i}} |u_\lambda^+|_{L^\gamma(B_{R+r}(x_i))}, \tag{3.18}$$

implying that

$$|u_\lambda^+|_{L^\infty(B_R(x_i))} \leq C|u_\lambda^+|_{L^\gamma(B_{R+r}(x_i))}.$$

Using the convergence of (u_λ^+) to 0 in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_\Gamma)$ as $\lambda \to \infty$, for a fixed $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\lambda_{\epsilon,i} \geq 1$ such that

$$|u_\lambda^+|_{L^\infty(B_R(x_i))} \leq \epsilon, \quad \forall \lambda \geq \lambda_{\epsilon,i}.$$

In particular, fixing $\epsilon = a$ and $\lambda_* = \max_{1\leq i\leq l}\{\lambda_{a,i}\}$, we conclude that

$$|u_\lambda^+|_{\infty,\mathcal{N}(\partial\Omega'_\Gamma)} \leq a \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda \geq \lambda^*. \tag{3.19}$$

Analogously, if we define for each $\lambda \geq 1$, $L > 0$ and $\beta > 1$, the functions $u_\lambda^- = \max\{-u_\lambda, 0\}$,

$$u_{L,\lambda}^- := \begin{cases} u_\lambda^-, & \text{if} \quad u_\lambda \geq -L, \\ L, & \text{if} \quad u_\lambda \leq -L, \end{cases}$$

$$z_{L,\lambda,i}^- := \eta_i^2 u_\lambda^- (u_{L,\lambda}^-)^{2(\beta-1)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad w_{L,\lambda,i}^- := \eta_i u_\lambda^- (u_{L,\lambda}^-)^{\beta-1},$$

we can prove that

$$|u_\lambda^-|_{\infty,\mathcal{N}(\partial\Omega'_\Gamma)} \leq a \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda \geq \lambda^*. \tag{3.20}$$

Thus, from (3.19) and (3.20),

$$|u_\lambda|_{\infty,\mathcal{N}(\partial\Omega'_\Gamma)} \leq a \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda \geq \lambda^*. \tag{3.21}$$

Now, for $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$, we define $v_\lambda : \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$v_\lambda(x) = (u_\lambda(x) - a)^+ .$$

From (3.19), we have $v_\lambda \in H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma)$. Using v_λ as a test function, it is possible to prove that $v_\lambda \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma$, that is, $u_\lambda(x) \leq a$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma$. Considering the function $(u_\lambda - a)^-$, the same argument works well to show that $u_\lambda(x) \geq -a$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma$. Thus, $|u_\lambda(x)| \leq a$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma$. Therefore, from Remark 3.1, the proof is finished.

■

4 A special family of nodal solution to $(A)_\lambda$

In this section, as in [4], we modify all the sets that appear in the minimax arguments explored in [23] to get nodal solutions. These modifications are necessary, because we are working with exponential critical growth, and in this case, the estimate involving the norm of sequences must be very carefully obtained to use the Tundiger-Moser inequalities mentioned in the introduction of a correct way. After that, using deformation lemma, we show the existence of a special family of nodal solutions to $(A)_\lambda$ for λ large enough. These nodal solutions are exactly the nodal solutions given in Theorem 1.1.

In what follows, let us fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $\zeta = \zeta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$I_j((1-\epsilon)w_j^\pm), \quad I_j((1+\epsilon)w_j^\pm) < I_j(w_j^\pm) - \zeta, \quad \text{for all} \quad j \in \Gamma. \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, without loss of generality, we can assume $\Gamma = \{1, ..., l\}$ $(l \leq k)$. In the sequel, we denote by $Q = (1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon)^{2l}$ and define $\gamma_0 : \overline{Q} \to \mathcal{H}_\lambda$ by

$$\gamma_0(\overrightarrow{s}, \overrightarrow{t})(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{l} s_j w_j^+ + \sum_{j=1}^{l} t_j w_j^-, \tag{4.2}$$

where $(\overrightarrow{s}, \overrightarrow{t}) = (s_1, ..., s_l, t_1, ..., t_l)$, and the number

$$S_{\lambda,\Gamma} = \inf_{\gamma \in \sum_\lambda} \max_{(\overrightarrow{s}, \overrightarrow{t}) \in \overline{Q}} \Phi_\lambda(\gamma(\overrightarrow{s}, \overrightarrow{t})),$$

where

$$\Sigma_\lambda = \left\{ \gamma \in C(\overline{Q}, \mathcal{H}_\lambda) : \ \gamma^\pm|_{\Omega'_j} \neq 0, \ \forall j \in \Gamma \text{ and } (\overrightarrow{s}, \ \overrightarrow{t}) \in \overline{Q}, \gamma = \gamma_0 \text{ on } \partial Q \right\}.$$

We remark that $\gamma_0 \in \Sigma_\lambda$, so $\Sigma_\lambda \neq \emptyset$ and $S_{\lambda,\Gamma}$ is well defined.

Lemma 4.1 *For any $\gamma \in \Sigma_\lambda$ there exists $(\overrightarrow{s}_*, \overrightarrow{t}_*) \in \overline{Q}$ such that*

$$\Phi'_{\lambda,j}\left(\gamma^{\pm}(\overrightarrow{s}_*, \overrightarrow{t}_*)\right)\left(\gamma^{\pm}(\overrightarrow{s}_*, \overrightarrow{t}_*)\right) = 0$$

for all $j \in \{1, ..., l\}$. As an immediate consequence,

$$\Phi_{\lambda,j}\left(\gamma^{\pm}(\overrightarrow{s}_*, \overrightarrow{t}_*)\right) \geq d_{\lambda,j}.$$

Proof. The proof follows as in [4, Lemma 4.1], because the growth of f is not relevant in this lemma. ∎

From now on, we denote by D_Γ the number $D_\Gamma = \sum_{j=1}^{l} d_j$.

Proposition 4.2 *The numbers D_Γ and $S_{\lambda,\Gamma}$ verify the following relations*

(*a*) $\sum_{j=1}^{l} d_{\lambda,j} \leq S_{\lambda,\Gamma} \leq D_\Gamma$ *for all $\lambda \geq 1$ and;*

(*b*) $S_{\lambda,\Gamma} \to D_\Gamma$ *as $\lambda \to \infty$.*

Proof.

(*a*) Since γ_0 defined in (4.2) belongs to Σ_λ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\lambda,\Gamma} &\leq \max_{(\overrightarrow{s},\overrightarrow{t})\in\overline{Q}} \Phi_\lambda(\gamma_0(\overrightarrow{s}, \overrightarrow{t})) \\ &\leq \max_{\overrightarrow{s}\in[1-\epsilon,1+\epsilon]^l} \sum_{j=1}^{l} I_j(s_j w_j^+) + \max_{\overrightarrow{t}\in[1-\epsilon,1+\epsilon]^l} \sum_{j=1}^{l} I_j(t_j w_j^-). \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of w_j, it is well known that

$$\max_{z\in[1-\epsilon,1+\epsilon]} I_j(z w_j^{\pm}) = I_j(w_j^{\pm}), \quad \text{for each} \quad j \in \Gamma, \tag{4.3}$$

and thus

$$S_{\lambda,\Gamma} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} d_j = D_\Gamma.$$

Now, for $\gamma \in \Sigma_\lambda$, let $(\overrightarrow{s}_*, \overrightarrow{t}_*) \in Q$ given by Lemma 4.1. Recalling that $\Phi_{\lambda,\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\Omega'_\Gamma}(u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega'_\Gamma)$, we have

$$\Phi_\lambda(\gamma(\overrightarrow{s}_*, \overrightarrow{t}_*)) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{l} \Phi_{\lambda,j}(\gamma(\overrightarrow{s}_*, \overrightarrow{t}_*)) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{l} d_{\lambda,j},$$

and so,

$$\max_{(\overrightarrow{s},\overrightarrow{t})\in\overline{Q}} \Phi_\lambda(\gamma(\overrightarrow{s},\overrightarrow{t})) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{l} d_{\lambda,j}.$$

Thereby, from definition of $S_{\lambda,\Gamma}$,

$$S_{\lambda,\Gamma} \geq \sum_{j=1}^{l} d_{\lambda,j},$$

finishing the proof of (a).

(b) We begin proving that $d_{\lambda,j} \to d_j$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. In fact, let (λ_n) be an arbitrary sequence with $\lambda_n \to +\infty$. Now, let $w_{\lambda_n,j} \in H^1(\Omega'_j)$ be a least energy nodal solution to Problem (2.4) given in Section 2.1, with $\lambda = \lambda_n$, i.e.

$$\Phi_{\lambda_n,j}(w_{\lambda_n,j}) = d_{\lambda_n,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi'_{\lambda_n,j}(w_{\lambda_n,j}) = 0 \tag{4.4}$$

The same arguments used in proof of Proposition 3.6 work to prove that, for each $j \in \Gamma$ and for a subsequence $(w_{\lambda_{n_k},j})$, there exists $w_{0,j}$ such that

$$w_{\lambda_{n_k},j} \to w_{0,j} \quad \text{in} \quad H^1(\Omega'_j) \quad \text{as} \quad n_k \to \infty.$$

Furthermore, $w_{0,j} \in H^1_0(\Omega_j)$ is a nodal solution of Problem (2.3). Therefore,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \Phi_{\lambda_{n_k},j}(w_{\lambda_{n_k},j}) = I_j(w_{0,j}) \geq d_j.$$

Once $d_{\lambda,j} \leq d_j$, we conclude that $d_{\lambda,j} \to d_j$ as $\lambda \to \infty$, from where it follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{l} d_{\lambda,j} \to D_\Gamma, \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to \infty.$$

The last limit together with (a) implies that (b) holds. ∎

Hereafter, $E^+_{\lambda,j}$ and $E^-_{\lambda,j}$ denote the cone of nonnegative and non-positive functions belong to $\mathcal{H}_\lambda(\Omega'_j)$, respectively, that is,

$$E^+_{\lambda,j} = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda(\Omega'_j) : \ u(x) \geq 0 \text{ a.e. in } \in \Omega'_j \right\}$$

and

$$E^-_{\lambda,j} = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda(\Omega'_j) : \ u(x) \leq 0 \text{ a.e. in } \in \Omega'_j \right\}.$$

From the definition of γ_0, there exists a positive constant τ such that

$$dist_{\lambda,j}\left(\gamma_0(\overrightarrow{s},\overrightarrow{t})|_{\Omega'_j}, E^\pm_{\lambda,j}\right) > \tau \ \text{ for all } \ (\overrightarrow{s},\overrightarrow{t}) \in Q, \ j \in \Gamma \ \text{ and } \ \lambda > 0,$$

where $dist_{\lambda,j}\,(K,F)$ denotes the distance between sets of $\mathcal{H}_\lambda(\Omega_j')$. Taking the number τ obtained in the last inequality, we define

$$\Theta = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda :\ dist_{\lambda,j}\left(u|_{\Omega_j'}, E^{\pm}_{\lambda,j} \right) \geq \tau \ \ \forall j \in \Gamma \right\}.$$

Moreover, for any $c, \mu > 0$ and $0 < \delta < \tau/2$, we set the sets

$$\Phi^c_\lambda = \{ u \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda :\ \Phi_\lambda(u) \leq c \} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{\lambda,\mu} = \{ u \in \Theta_{2\delta} : \quad |\Phi_\lambda(u) - S_{\lambda,j}| \leq \mu \},$$

where Θ_r, for $r > 0$, denotes the set $\Theta_r = \{ u \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda :\ dist_{\lambda,j}\,(u,\Theta) \leq r \}$.

Notice that for each $\mu > 0$, there exists $\Lambda^* = \Lambda^*(\mu) > 0$ such that

$$w = \sum_{j=1}^{l} w_j \in B_{\lambda,\mu}, \quad \text{for all} \ \ \lambda \geq \Lambda^*,$$

because $w \in \Theta$, $\Phi_\lambda(w) = D_\Gamma$ and $S_{\lambda,\Gamma} \to D_\Gamma$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. Therefore, $B_{\lambda,\mu} \neq \emptyset$ for λ sufficiently large.

Observe that, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\left\| \gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t}) \right\|^2_\lambda \leq (1+\epsilon)^2 \sum_{j=1}^{l} \|w_j\|^2_{\Omega_j} \leq M := \frac{2\theta D_\Gamma}{\theta - 2}(1+\epsilon)^2 < 1.$$

The fact that $M < 1$ is crucial in our argument, because we are working with exponential critical growth, see for example, Claim 4.5 below . However, this type of analysis is not necessary when $N \geq 3$, see [3], [4] and [5].

In the sequel, for $r > 0$, let us consider

$$\overline{B}_r(0) = \{ u \in \mathcal{H}_\lambda :\ \|u\|_\lambda \leq r \},$$

and we denote by μ^* the ensuing real number

$$\mu^* = \min\left\{ \frac{M+1}{2}, \frac{\delta}{2} \right\}. \tag{4.5}$$

As a consequence of the above consideration, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.3 *For each $\mu > 0$ fixed, there exist $\sigma_o = \sigma_o(\mu) > 0$ and $\Lambda_* = \Lambda_*(\mu) \geq 1$ independent of λ such that*

$$\|\Phi'_\lambda(u)\|^*_\lambda \geq \sigma_o \ \ \textit{for} \ \ \lambda \geq \Lambda_* \ \ \textit{and all} \ \ u \in (B_{\lambda,2\mu} \setminus B_{\lambda,\mu}) \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0) \cap \Phi^{D_\Gamma}_\lambda.$$

Proof. Arguing by contradition, we assume that there exist $\lambda_n \to \infty$ and

$$u_n \in (B_{\lambda_n,2\mu} \setminus B_{\lambda_n,\mu}) \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0) \cap \Phi^{D_\Gamma} \tag{4.6}$$

such that $\|\Phi'_{\lambda_n}(u_n)\|^*_{\lambda_n} \to 0$, as $\lambda_n \to \infty$. Since

$$S_{\lambda_n,\Gamma} - \Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \leq |\Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_n) - S_{\lambda_n,\Gamma}| \leq 2\mu,$$

and $S_{\lambda_n,\Gamma} = D_\Gamma + o_n(1)$, we derive

$$D_\Gamma - 2\mu + o_n(1) \leq \Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \leq D_\Gamma.$$

Thus, $(\Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_n))$ is a bounded sequence and we may suppose

$$\Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to d \in [D_\Gamma - 2\mu, D_\Gamma],$$

after extracting a subsequence. Applying Proposition 3.6, we can extract a subsequence $u_n \to u$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, where u is a solution of $(P)_j$ with

$$\|u_n - u\|_{\lambda_n} \to 0, \quad \lambda_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_n|^2 \to 0 \ \text{ and } \ \|u_n\|_{\lambda_n,\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\Omega_\Gamma} \to 0.$$

Once $u_n \in \Theta_{2\delta}$, we have that $\|u_n^\pm\|_{\lambda_n,\Omega'_j} \geq \tau - 2\delta > 0$, for all λ_n, leading to $\|u^\pm\|_{\Omega_j} \neq 0$, for all $j \in \Gamma$. Then, u is a nodal solution of $(P)_j$, for all $j \in \Gamma$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{l} d_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^{l} I_j(u|_{\Omega_j}) \leq D_\Gamma.$$

This fact gives $I_j(u|_{\Omega_j}) = d_j$, for all $j \in \Gamma$, and hence $\Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to D_\Gamma$. On the other hand, since $S_{\lambda_n,\Gamma} \to D_\Gamma$, we have

$$|\Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_n) - S_{\lambda_n,\Gamma}| \to 0, \quad \text{as} \ \ \lambda_n \to \infty.$$

Therefore, $u_n \in B_{\lambda_n,\mu}$, for n large enough, which contradicts (4.6). ∎

Proposition 4.4 *For each $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$, there exists $\Lambda^* = \Lambda^*(\mu) > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \geq \Lambda^*$ the functional Φ_λ has a critical point in $B_{\lambda,\mu} \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4} \cap \Phi_\lambda^{D_\Gamma}$.*

Proof. Arguing again by contradiction, we suppose that there exist $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$ and a sequence $\lambda_n \to +\infty$, such that Φ_{λ_n} has no critical points in $B_{\lambda_n,\mu} \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4} \cap \Phi_{\lambda_n}^{D_\Gamma}$. From Proposition 3.4, the $(PS)_c$ condition holds for Φ_{λ_n}, for $c \in (0, D]$. Thus, there exists a constant $d_{\lambda_n} > 0$ such that

$$\|\Phi'_{\lambda_n}(u_n)\|^*_{\lambda_n} \geq d_{\lambda_n} \ \text{ for all } \ u \in B_{\lambda_n,\mu} \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0) \cap \Phi_{\lambda_n}^{D_\Gamma}.$$

Moreover, from Proposition 4.3, we also have

$$\|\Phi'_{\lambda_n}(u)\|^*_{\lambda_n} \geq \sigma_o \ \text{ for all } \ u \in (B_{\lambda_n,2\mu} \setminus B_{\lambda_n,\mu}) \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0) \cap \Phi^{D_\Gamma}_{\lambda_n}$$

and for all $\lambda_n \geq \Lambda_*$, where $\sigma_o > 0$ is independent of λ_n, for n large enough.

In what follows, $\Psi_n : \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_n} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $H_n : \Phi^{D_\Gamma}_{\lambda_n} \to \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_n}$ are continuous functions verifying

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_n(u) = 1, &\quad \text{for } \ u \in B_{\lambda_n,3\mu/2} \cap \Theta_\delta \cap \overline{B}_{(M+1)/2}(0), \\ \Psi_n(u) = 0, &\quad \text{for } \ u \notin B_{\lambda_n,3\mu/2} \cap \Theta_\delta \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0), \\ 0 \leq \Psi_n(u) \leq 1, &\quad \text{for } \ u \in \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_n}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$H_n(u) = \begin{cases} -\Psi_n(u)\|Y_n(u)\|^{-1}Y_n(u), & \text{for } \ u \in B_{\lambda_n,2\mu} \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0), \\ 0, & \text{for } \ u \notin B_{\lambda_n,2\mu} \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0), \end{cases}$$

where Y_n is a pseudo-gradient vector field for Φ_{λ_n} on

$$\mathcal{M}_n = \{u \in \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_n} : \ \Phi'_{\lambda_n}(u) \neq 0\}.$$

From the definition of H_n,

$$\|H_n(u)\| \leq 1, \ \text{ for all } \ u \in \Phi^{D_\Gamma}_{\lambda_n}.$$

Hence, there exists a deformation flow $\eta_n : [0,\infty) \times \Phi^{D_\Gamma}_{\lambda_n} \to \Phi^{D_\Gamma}_{\lambda_n}$ given by

$$\frac{d\eta_n}{dt} = H_n(\eta_n), \qquad \eta_n(0,u) = u \in \Phi^{D_\Gamma}_{\lambda_n}.$$

This flow satisfies the following basic properties:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi_{\lambda_n}(\eta_n(t,u)) \leq -\Psi_n(\eta_n(t,u))\|\Phi'_{\lambda_n}(\eta_n(t,u))\| \leq 0, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\left\|\frac{d\eta_n}{dt}\right\|_{\lambda_n} = \|H_n(\eta_n)\|_{\lambda_n} \leq 1 \tag{4.8}$$

and

$$\eta_n(t,u) = u, \quad \forall t \geq 0, \ \ u \notin B_{\lambda_n,2\mu} \cap \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0). \tag{4.9}$$

Next, let us show that the functions $\gamma_n : \overline{Q} \to \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_n}$ belongs to Σ_{λ_n}, for n large enough. We begin observing that γ_n is a continuous function in $\overline{Q}$. Since $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$, from (4.1), (4.3) and (4.5),

$$|\Phi_{\lambda_n}(\gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t})) - D_\Gamma| > \zeta \geq \delta \geq 2\mu^*, \quad \forall (\vec{s},\vec{t}) \in \partial Q,\ n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, using again the fact that $S_{\lambda,\Gamma} \to D_\Gamma$ quando $\lambda \to \infty$, there exists $n_o > 0$ such that

$$|\Phi_{\lambda_n}(\gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t})) - S_{\lambda_n,\Gamma}| > 2\mu,\ \forall (\vec{s},\vec{t}) \in \partial Q,\ n \geq n_o,$$

which implies that $\gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t}) \notin B_{\lambda_n,2\mu}$, for all $(\vec{s},\vec{t}) \in \partial Q$ and $n \geq n_o$. So,

$$\eta_n(t, \gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t})) = \gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t}) \text{ for all } (\vec{s},\vec{t}) \in \partial Q.$$

Now, we only have to prove that

$$\gamma_n(\vec{s},\vec{t})^\pm \in H^1(\Omega_j') \setminus \{0\},$$

for all $j \in \Gamma$ and $(\vec{s},\vec{t}) \in Q$.

Once that $\gamma_n(\vec{s},\vec{t}) = \eta_n(T_n, \gamma_o(\vec{s},\vec{t})) \in \Theta_{2\delta}$ for all n, we have

$$dist_{\lambda_n,j}(\gamma_n(\vec{s},\vec{t}), E^\pm_{\lambda_n,j}) \geq \tau - 2\delta > 0.$$

Then, $\gamma_n^\pm|_{\Omega_j} \neq 0$ for all $j \in \Gamma$, implying that $\gamma_n \in \Sigma_{\lambda_n}$ for n large enough.

Note that *supt* $\gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t}) \subset \overline{\Omega}_\Gamma$ for all $(\vec{s},\vec{t}) \in \overline{Q}$ and that $\Phi_\lambda(\gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t}))$ does not depend on $\lambda \geq 1$. Furthermore,

$$\Phi_\lambda(\gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t})) \leq D_\Gamma, \quad \text{for all } \ (\vec{s},\vec{t}) \in \overline{Q}$$

and

$$\Phi_\lambda(\gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t})) = D_\Gamma \ \text{ if, and only if, } \ s_j = t_j = 1, \quad \forall j \in \{1, ..., l\}.$$

Therefore, the number

$$m_0^n := \sup\left\{\Phi_{\lambda_n}(u) :\ u \in \gamma_0(Q) \setminus (B_{\lambda_n,\mu} \cap \overline{B}_{\frac{M+1}{2}}(0))\right\},$$

is independent of λ_n and verifies

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} m_0^n < D_\Gamma.$$

The next claim is crucial, because we are working with exponential growth, and some arguments used in [3], [4] and [5] cannot be used directly, so a careful analysis is necessary.

Claim 4.5 *There exists a constant $K > 0$ such that*

$$|\Phi_{\lambda_n}(u) - \Phi_{\lambda_n}(v)| \leq K\|u - v\|_{\lambda_n}$$

for all $u, v \in \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0)$.

In fact, let $u, v \in \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0)$, there is $K > 0$ such that

$$|\langle \Phi'_{\lambda_n}(tu + (1-t)v), w\rangle| \leq K, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{H}_{\lambda_n},\ \|w\|_{\lambda_n} \leq 1.$$

Since,

$$|\langle \Phi'_{\lambda_n}(tu + (1-t)v), w\rangle| \leq \frac{M+3}{2} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |g(tu + (1-t)v)w|,$$

we only need to prove the boundedness of the above integral. Using the growth of g given in (3.4),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |g(tu + (1-t)v)w| \leq \frac{M+3}{2} + C\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w|b_\tau(tu + (1-t)v). \tag{4.10}$$

By the Hölder's inequality,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |w|b_\tau(tu + (1-t)v) \leq |w|_{q'}|b_\tau(tu + (1-t)v)|_q, \tag{4.11}$$

where $1/q + 1/q' = 1$. Since $M < 1$,

$$\|tu + (1-t)v\|_{\lambda_n} \leq t\|u\|_{\lambda_n} + (1-t)\|v\|_{\lambda_n} \leq \frac{M+3}{4} < 1.$$

Then, we can take $q > 1$, q near 1, such that $q\tau(M+3)/4 < 1$. Thus, from Corollary 2.1

$$|b_\tau(tu + (1-t)v)|_q \leq C, \quad \forall t \in [0,1],\ u, v \in B_{(M+3)/4}(0). \tag{4.12}$$

Therefore, from (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |f(tu + (1-t)v)w| \leq C, \qquad \forall u, v \in \overline{B}_{(M+3)/4}(0),\ t \in [0,1],\ \|w\|_\lambda \leq 1,$$

showing that Claim 4.5 holds.

As a consequence of the above considerations, we are able to repeat the arguments found in [4] to prove the ensuing claim

Claim 4.6 *There exists $T_n = T(\lambda_n) > 0$ and $\epsilon^* > 0$ independent of n such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\{ \max_{(\vec{s},\vec{t})\in Q} \Phi_{\lambda_n}(\eta_n(T_n, \gamma_0(\vec{s},\vec{t}))) \right\} < D_\Gamma - \epsilon^*.$$

The above claim gives

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} S_{\lambda_n,\Gamma} \leq D_\Gamma - \epsilon^*,$$

which contradicts the Proposition 4.2, and the proposition follows.

■

From the last proposition, we have the following result.

Proposition 4.7 *For each $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$ fixed, there exist $\Lambda^* = \Lambda^*(\mu) > 1$ such that $(A)_\lambda$ has a nodal solution $u_\lambda \in B_{\lambda,\mu}$ for all $\lambda \geq \Lambda^*$.*

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

From Proposition 4.7, for each $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$ fixed, there exists $\Lambda^* = \Lambda^*(\mu) > 1$ such that the auxiliary problem $(A)_\lambda$ has a nodal solution $u_\lambda \in B_{\lambda,\mu}$ for $\lambda \geq \Lambda^*$ with

$$dist_{\lambda,j}(u_\lambda, E^{\pm}_{\lambda,j}) \geq \tau - 2\delta > 0 \quad \forall j \in \Gamma. \tag{5.1}$$

Repeating the same arguments used in the proof of Proposition 3.6, we get

$$u_\lambda \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad H^1(\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_\Gamma) \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to \infty.$$

This together with Proposition 3.8 implies that u_λ is a nodal solution to $(P)_\lambda$, for λ large enough.

Fixing $\lambda_n \to +\infty$, the sequence (u_{λ_n}) verifies

$$\Phi'_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) = S_{\lambda_n,\Gamma} + o_n(1),$$

and so,

$$\Phi'_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{\lambda_n}(u_{\lambda_n}) = D_\Gamma + o_n(1).$$

Therefore, (u_{λ_n}) is a $(PS)_{\infty,D_\Gamma}$, with $D_\Gamma \in (0, D]$. By Proposition 3.6, there exists $u \in H^1_0(\Omega_\Gamma)$ such that, for some subsequence still denoted by (u_{λ_n}),

$$u_{\lambda_n} \to u \ \text{ in } \ H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \ \ \lambda_n \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_{\lambda_n}|^2 \to 0 \ \text{ and } \ \|u_{\lambda_n}\|^2_{\lambda_n,\mathbb{R}^2\setminus\Omega_\Gamma} \to 0.$$

From the above limits, we see that

$$I_j(u) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad j \in \Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{l} I_j(u) = D_\Gamma. \tag{5.2}$$

Once (u_{λ_n}) verifies (5.1), we derive that

$$\tau - 2\delta \leq \|u^{\pm}_{\lambda_n}\|_{\lambda_n,\Omega'_j}, \quad \forall j \in \Gamma,\ \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{5.3}$$

Using these information, we are ready to prove the following claim

Claim 5.1 *There exists $\kappa_o > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{\Omega_j} |u^{\pm}_{\lambda_n}|^{q'} \geq \kappa_o \quad \forall \lambda_n \geq \Lambda^*,\ \forall j \in \Gamma, \tag{5.4}$$

for some $q' > 1$.

In fact, let us fix $j \in \Gamma$ and consider $\eta_i \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2, \mathbb{R})$ satisfying

$$\eta_j \equiv 1 \ \text{ in } \ \Omega'_j \ \text{ e } \ \eta_j \equiv 0 \ \text{ in } \ \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus (\Omega'_j)_\delta \ \text{ and } \ ((\Omega'_j)_\delta \setminus \Omega'_j) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_\Gamma.$$

Taking $v_j = \eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n}$ as a test function, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \nabla u_{\lambda_n} \nabla(\eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n}) + (\lambda_n V(x) + 1) u_{\lambda_n} \eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(u_{\lambda_n}) \eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n},$$

from where it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u^+_{\lambda_n}|^2 \eta_j + (\lambda_n V(x) + 1)|u^+_{\lambda_n}|^2 \eta_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(u_{\lambda_n}) \eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n} + o_n(1). \tag{5.5}$$

Combining the growth of f and Hölder's inequality, we know that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(u_{\lambda_n}) \eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n} \leq \epsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u^+_{\lambda_n}|^2 \eta_j + C \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n}|^{q'} \right)^{1/q'} |b_\tau(u_{\lambda_n})|_q$$

where $1/q + 1/q' = 1$. On the other hand, as in Proposition 3.4, we can extract a subsequence verifying

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \|u_{\lambda_n}\|^2 \leq m < 1.$$

Fixing $q > 1$, with q sufficiently close to 1 and using Corollary 2.1, we derive

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(u_{\lambda_n})\eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n} \leq \epsilon \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u^+_{\lambda_n}|^2\eta_j + C\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n}|^{q'}\right)^{1/q'}. \tag{5.6}$$

From (5.5) and (5.6),

$$(1-\epsilon)\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u^+_{\lambda_n}|^2\eta_j + (\lambda_n V(x)+1)|u^+_{\lambda_n}|^2\eta_j \leq C\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\eta_j u^+_{\lambda_n}|^{q'}\right)^{1/q'} + o_n(1).$$

Thereby, fixing $\epsilon < 1$ and using (5.3),

$$0 < (1-\epsilon)(\tau - 2\delta) \leq (1-\epsilon)\|u^+_{\lambda_n}\|^2_{\lambda_n,\Omega'_j} \leq C\left(\int_{\Omega'_j} |u^+_{\lambda_n}|^{q'}\right)^{1/q'} + o_n(1),$$

implying that there is $\kappa_o > 0$,

$$\int_{\Omega'_j} |u^+_{\lambda_n}|^{q'} \geq \kappa_o > 0, \quad \forall \lambda_n \geq \Lambda^*.$$

The same arguments work to prove that

$$\int_{\Omega'_j} |u^-_{\lambda_n}|^{q'} \geq \kappa_o > 0, \quad \forall \lambda_n \geq \Lambda^*,$$

and the proof of Claim 5.1 is complete.

Passing to the limit as $n \to \infty$ in (5.4), we derive

$$\int_{\Omega'_j} |u^\pm|^{q'} = \int_{\Omega_j} |u^\pm|^{q'} \geq \kappa_o, \quad \forall j \in \Gamma.$$

Thus, u changes sign in Ω_j, for all $j \in \Gamma$. Consequently,

$$I_j(u) \geq d_j, \quad \forall j \in \Gamma. \tag{5.7}$$

From (5.2) and (5.7), follows that $I_j(u) = d_j$ for all $j \in \Gamma$. This shows that, for each $j \in \Gamma$, $u|_{\Omega_j}$ is a least energy nodal solution for the problem (2.3), finishing the proof . ■

References

[1] A. Adimurthi, *Existence of Positive solutions of the semilinear Dirichlet problem with critical growth for the N-Laplacian*, Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa, 17 (1990), 393-413.

[2] A. Adimurthi and S. L. Yadava, *Critical exponent problem in* $\mathbb{R}^2$ *with Neumann boundary condition,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations, 15 (1990), 461-501.

[3] C. O. Alves, *Existence of multi-bump solutions for a class of quasilinear problems*, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. 6 (2006), 491–509.

[4] C. O. Alves, *Multiplicity of multi-bump type nodal solutions for a class of elliptic problems in* $\mathbb{R}^N$, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. 34 (2009), 231–250.

[5] C. O. Alves, D.C. de Morais Filho and M. A. S. Souto, *Multiplicity of positive solutions for a class of problems with critical growth in* $\mathbb{R}^N$, Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc., 52 (2009), 1-21.

[6] C. O. Alves, João Marcos do Ó and O. H. Miyagaki, *On nonlinear perturbations of a periodic elliptic problem in* $\mathbb{R}^2$ *involving critical growth*, Nonlinear Anal. 56 (2004), 781–791.

[7] C. O. Alves and M.C. Ferreira, *Multi-bump solutions for a class of quasilinear problems involving variable exponents*. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., DOI 10.1007/s10231-014-0434-2.

[8] C. O. Alves and G.M. Figueiredo, *Existence and multiplicity of positive solutions to a p-Laplacian equation in* $\mathbb{R}^N$, Differential Integral Equations, 19 (2006), 143-162.

[9] C. O. Alves and D. S. Pereira, *Existence and nonexistence of least energy nodal solution for a class of elliptic problem in* $\mathbb{R}^2$, to appear in Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.

[10] C. O. Alves and M. A. S. Souto, *Multiplicity of positive solutions for a class of problems with exponential critical growth in* $\mathbb{R}^2$, J. Differential Equations 244 (2008), 1502-1520.

[11] T. Bartsch, A. Pankov and Z.-Q. Wang, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations with steep potential well.* Comm. Contemp. Math. 4 (2001), 549–569.

[12] T. Bartsch and Z.-Q. Wang, *Existence and multiplicity results for some superlinear elliptic problems on* $\mathbb{R}^N$. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 20 (1995), 1725–1741.

[13] T. Bartsch and T. Weth, *A note on additional properties of sign changing solutions to superlinear elliptic equations*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. 22 (2003), 1–14.

[14] T. Bartsch, T. Weth and M. Willem, *Partial symmetry of least energy nodal solutions to some variational problems*, J. Anal. Math. 96 (2005), 1–18.

[15] D. M. Cao, *Nontrivial solution of semilinear elliptic equation with critical exponent in* $\mathbb{R}^2$, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 17 (1992),407–435.

[16] M. Clapp and Y. H. Ding, *Minimal nodal solution of a Schrödinger equations with critical nonlinearity*, Differential Integral Equations 16 (2003), 981-992.

[17] M. del Pino and P. L. Felmer, *Local mountain passes for semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 4 (1996), 121-137.

[18] João Marcos do Ó, *Quasilinear elliptic equations with exponential nonlinearities*, Comm. Appl. Nonlin. Anal. 2 (1995), 63-72.

[19] João Marcos do Ó, *Semilinear dirichlet problems for the* N*-Laplacian in* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *with nonlinearities in the critical growth range*, Diff. Int. Equ. 9 (1996), 967-979.

[20] João Marcos do Ó, N*-Laplacian equations in* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *with critical growth*, Abstract Appl. Anal. 2 (1997), 301-315.

[21] João Marcos do Ó, Manassés de Souza, Everaldo de Medeiros and Uberlandio Severo. *An improvement for the TrudingerMoser inequality and applications*. J. Differential Equations 256 (2014) 1317-1349.

[22] João Marcos do Ó and B. Ruf. *On a Schrödinger equation with periodic potential and critical growth in* $\mathbb{R}^2$. Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. 13 (2006) 167-192.

[23] Y. H. Ding and K. Tanaka, *Multiplicity of positive solutions of a nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Manuscripta Math. 112 (2003), 109-135.

[24] D.G. de Figueiredo, O.H. Miyagaki and B. Ruf, *Elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with nonlinearities in the critical growth range*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 3 (1995) 139-153.

[25] D.G. de Figueiredo, João Marcos do Ó and B. Ruf, *On an inequality by N. Trudinger and J. Moser and related elliptic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 55 (2002), 1-18.

[26] C. Gui, *Existence of multi-bump solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations via variational method*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 21 (1996), 787-820.

[27] J. Moser, *A new proof of de Giorgis theorem concerning the regularity problem for elliptic differential equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 13 (1960), 457-468.

[28] J. Moser, *A sharp form of an inequality by N. Trudinger*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. 20 (1971), 1077-1092.

[29] N. S. Trudinger, *On imbedding into Orlicz spaces and some application*, J. Math Mech. 17 (1967), 473-483.